

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-2, and 5-10 are currently amended. No new matter has been added as support for all amendments may be found throughout the specification, claims, and drawings as originally filed. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 2, 3, and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding claim 3, the phases “polling period” and “polling interval” haven’t been found.

Applicant believes that the amended claims are clear and all based on the original application. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw these objections.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-7 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Sachse (U.S. Pat. No. 6,985,901). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is directed to a dispatching method of which the objects to be dispatched are device data set to be polled. In the device data set, the devices are sorted based

on their types, and then various data belonging to the same device may be further sorted to different modules with different priority attributes and different polling period attributes. When a system polling is initiated, modules to be polled currently may be determined from the first set of device to be polled in accordance with claimed invention.

Sachse, however, only at best discloses using a predetermined interval to perform a polling. Sachse is generally directed to a technical solution for maintaining a predetermined agreement upon QoS as described above. Sachse fails to anticipate the limitations as recited in claim 1.

Amended claim 1 inherently defines that multiple modules belonging to the same device may be polled with different polling periods based on the different priorities and polling periods thereof. Applicant submits that Sachse fails to disclose any technical feature indicating multiple modules belonging to the same device may be polled with different polling periods.

In view of above, Applicant submits that the amended claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-10 define over Sachse.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 8 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sachse in view of Baldwin (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0154271). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant has amended claims 8-9. As argued in the above section, Applicant submits that Sachse and Baldwin, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest all the limitations as recited in either of claim 8 and claim 9.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 8-9 define over Sachse and Baldwin. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 08-0750, under Order No. 9896-000058/US/NP from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: October 23, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By /Joseph M. Lafata/
Joseph M. Lafata
Registration No.: 37,166
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1223
Attorney for Applicant